

AA0007561764



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

BURN

The Present and Long - Continued
Stagnation of Trade:

HF
3505.8
B8
1870

THE PRESENT AND LONG-CONTINUED
STAGNATION OF TRADE:
Its Causes, Effects, and Cure.

BEING A SEQUEL TO

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE

COMMERCIAL POSITION

OF

GREAT BRITAIN, &c.

BY A MANCHESTER MAN.

REVISED AND ENLARGED EDITION.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

MANCHESTER:
JOHN HEYWOOD, 141 & 143, DEANSGATE.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.



PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE figures in the following statement are taken from Government returns and other authentic sources. The subject is not treated as a party question. It affects persons of all shades of politics. Employer and employed are alike interested: the former finds his capital gradually dwindling away, while the latter is either starving or obliged to leave the country. The writer has drawn certain conclusions from the facts stated. It is for the reader to judge how far these conclusions are correct.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

SINCE writing the above, in consequence of the large and rapid sale of the first edition of this Pamphlet (all the copies having been immediately disposed of), the writer has been requested to issue a second and revised edition, making the tables of Government returns, &c., more complete by bringing them down to the present time, and bringing forward some additional facts that tend to further elucidate the subject, and show its paramount importance to all classes of the commercial community.

R. BURN.

Manchester, August 10th, 1869.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE STAGNATION OF TRADE:

ITS CAUSES, EFFECTS, AND CURE.

THE trade of this country has fallen into such a deplorable position that there is scarcely a single branch of it which does not leave a very heavy loss to the producers, and consequently little inducement for the investment of capital and the employment of labour; indeed, the amount of distress that at present pervades the industrial interests of this kingdom is truly deplorable, and the future appears still more clouded than the present.

The cause of such a state of things, I feel very sure, arises almost exclusively from foreign competition, which has increased to such an extent that, a few years since, would have been thought fabulous, and no doubt was not anticipated by the most acute politicians a quarter of a century ago. It was then thought that as manufacturers we reigned supreme, and could defy all competition. However, experience has proved the reverse, and we now find that, unless we can obtain foreign reciprocity, even by begging that which we could once have commanded, we must descend to a position lower than that which we at present hold.

Fortunately, we have one chance left of redeeming ourselves, to a certain extent, viz., in the case of the French Treaty, which expires early in the coming year; and, as we have suffered so severely from an unequal competition with that country, I shall endeavour to show the consequences to this kingdom of our present policy, and its ruinous effects upon our manufacturing interests, as well as the disastrous results of the hostile tariffs of our foreign competitors.

In the first place, it is necessary to bring before the reader the state of our foreign trade at three different

periods, commencing with 1854, the first year that the Government published the real value of our imports, and in 1860, being the year previous to the French Commercial Tariff, and, lastly, in 1868. But as the Board of Trade has not yet given the real value of foreign productions exported from this country, I have used the same amount as in 1867.

The statements then are as follow:—

TOTAL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF GREAT BRITAIN.			
Total Imports.		Total Exports.	
	£		£
1854.—Imports.....	152,398,053	British.....	97,184,726
Exports.....	115,821,092	Foreign and Colonial	18,636,366
	<hr/>		<hr/>
Excess of Imports...	36,576,961	Total Exports.....	115,821,092
	Excess of Imports over British Exports, £55,204,327.		
	£		£
1860.—Imports.....	210,530,873	British.....	135,891,227
Exports.....	164,521,351	Foreign and Colonial	28,630,124
	<hr/>		<hr/>
Excess of Imports...	46,009,522	Total Exports.....	164,521,351
	Excess of Imports over British Exports, £74,639,646.		
	£		£
1868.—Imports.....	295,511,566	British.....	179,463,644
Exports.....	224,336,809	Foreign and Colonial	44,873,165
	<hr/>		<hr/>
Excess of Imports...	71,174,757	Total Exports.....	224,336,809
	Excess of Imports over British Exports, £116,047,922.		

From the above table it will be seen that our imports in 1854 exceeded our exports of British productions by £55,213,327; and in 1860 by £74,639,646; and in 1868 by the enormous sum of £116,047,922, which exceeds our total exports of British productions in 1854 by £19,363,196; and, further, while we have increased our imports since 1854 by £143,113,513, for a population of 30 millions, we have only increased our British Exports, to the 1,000 millions of people who inhabit the rest of the world, by £82,278,918. The question that naturally arises is, Are our British exports a fair equivalent for the amount of our foreign imports? Does the labour and capital of this country bear a satisfactory comparison with the labour

and capital employed in foreign countries upon our imports? If so, why have we so much distress in England, and from what cause does it arise? It is said to be from over-production. If this be the case, what is to become of our increasing population? At present they are emigrating as fast as they can find means for doing so. But, before this excuse is taken as sound argument for our present position, it would be well to search through the list of our imports, and see if there are not many articles which we can produce ourselves, which would serve to employ and improve the condition of our labourers at home. To say that, because they can be made cheaper abroad, our consumers have a right to demand their free admission, is absolute nonsense, so long as such imports bear no portion of our taxation, but rather increase our poor rates, by throwing our operatives out of employment: it is merely impoverishing the many to benefit the few—in fact, robbing the industrious to serve the non-producers.

Taking a more general view of this question it must be admitted that the balance of our foreign trade is paid for in gold, and had it not been for the discovery of that metal in California and Australia, the policy we are at present pursuing would have broken down long since. The Bank of England has now less bullion in her coffers than she had when those discoveries were made; so that we have been enriching other countries at our national expense.

The balance against us in our foreign trade, in 1868, amounted to 116 millions sterling; but these figures scarcely show its importance as bearing upon the commerce of this country, but will be more explicitly seen in the following table:—

TOTAL EXPORT OF TEXTILE FABRICS IN 1868.

	£
Cotton Yarn.....	14,709,194
“ Manufactures.....	50,128,760
Linen Yarn.....	2,309,111
“ Manufactures.....	6,695,771
Silk (thrown).....	1,239,252
“ Manufactures.....	1,082,608
Woollen and Worsted Yarn.	6,376,015
“ Manufactures.....	19,525,646

£102,066,357

The excess in our imports over our total exports of British productions in 1868 being £116,047,922, on reference to the above table it will be seen that that amount is £13,981,565 more than the whole of our exports of textile manufactures and yarns to the whole world in 1868; proving at once that the true cause of our present distress in the manufacturing districts is the excess of our imports, or the unrestricted admission of the productions of the world, without one single thought or care as to their effects upon the industrial portion of our population. In fact, our present tariff is a perfect anomaly: we admit the import of tea, coffee, and sugar—articles which we cannot produce ourselves only at *heavy duties*; and yet we admit the silks, the gold watches, the hats, the gloves, and the better class of woollens and printed cottons, all of which are luxuries, *duty free*; and, to more fully expose the absurdity and injustice of such a policy, I give the import of such articles that are charged with duty for the first 11 months of 1868, being the last returns.

VALUE OF IMPORTS IN 1868.

	£
Cocoa	359,150
Coffee	4,857,662
Dried Fruit.....	2,513,156
Spirits.....	2,085,989
Sugar	14,503,663
Molasses.....	519,968
Tea	12,431,454
Wine.....	5,441,098
	<hr/>
	42,712,140
Corn.....	39,230,053 (since repealed)
	<hr/>
Total 1868.....	81,942,193

So that out of the total imports of foreign productions, amounting to £295,511,516, £81,942,193 are charged with high duties, all of which, with the exception of corn, &c., consist of such articles as we cannot produce ourselves, and yet form a large portion of the food of the people; while the remaining £213,569,323 of our imports are admitted *duty free*, the free import of many of them

being the very bane of our commercial industry. What, for instance, must be the effects of the free admission of 362,523 clocks and watches, of 77,145,920 yards of cotton manufactures, of 404,544 cwts. of glass, of 327,003 lbs. of straw hats and bonnets, of 468,240 pairs of boots and shoes, of 10,714,188 pairs of kid, &c., gloves, of 370,606 cwt. of paper, of 326,574 lbs. of thrown silk, of 3,866,136 lbs. of silk manufactures, of £2,261,192 of woollen and worsted manufactures, and of 9,337,947 lbs. of woollen and worsted yarn? What amount of labour would not these articles have found for our half-starving population? The increase in the number of paupers in England since 1860 is 183,803 persons, being about equal to the population of Stockport, Bolton, and Blackburn. Only contrast the character of these *duty-free* imports with that portion upon which we charge a duty, amounting annually to over 22 millions sterling. Is this wise or just legislation?

To still further show that the great disparity between our imports and our British exports emanates principally from countries which are rivalling us in our manufactured productions, I give the following statement:—

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, 1868.

Total Imports from	£	Total British Exports to £
Russia.....	20,050,162	4,250,721
Sweden, Norway, and Denmark.....	8,687,852	2,834,139
Prussia.....	7,320,410	3,070,515
Belgium.....	8,255,043	3,149,769
France.....	34,584,343	10,633,721
Spain.....	6,590,958	2,206,470
United States.....	43,063,178	21,410,184
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	128,551,946	47,555,519
	47,555,519	
	<hr/>	<hr/>

Excess of Imports..... 80,996,427

Thus, in our trade with the above countries, the imports exceed our British exports by about 81 millions sterling, a sum equal to the whole of our revenue from official and local taxation; and all these countries send competing commodities to our home market.

FRANCE.

I will now endeavour to show the present position of our trade with France, and this is the more important as the treaty of 1861 expires in 1870.

TRADE WITH FRANCE.			
Imports from	Exports to		Total Exports.
£		£	£
1855.— 9,146,418	British Exports.....	6,012,658	} 10,421,881
	Foreign and Colonial	4,409,223	
1856.—10,386,522	British.....	6,432,650	} 10,471,077
	Foreign and Colonial	4,038,427	
1857.—11,965,407	British.....	6,213,358	} 11,326,823
	Foreign and Colonial	5,113,465	
1861.—17,826,646	British.....	8,895,588	} 17,427,413
	Foreign and Colonial	8,531,825	
1868.—34,584,343	British.....	10,633,721	} 25,633,721
	Foreign and Colonial	15,000,000	

In 1855-6-7, previous to the French Treaty, we admitted the free import of French productions, except wine and brandy, and we imported from thence, on the aggregate of the three years, commodities to the amount of £31,498,347; while we exported to France in the same period, of our own productions, only £18,658,666, and re-exported to that country foreign and colonial produce, amounting to £13,561,115, being an export of £721,434 above our imports from France. But France would have taken from us our re-exports of foreign produce under any circumstances, because she had not a direct trade to enable her to obtain them from the countries of their growth; and, in respect to the export of our British productions, if we had had the same privileges extended to us as we have given to France, we should have been enabled to have sent our productions into France upon a far more extended scale, which would only have been justice to our own labour and capital.

In 1855-6-7, collectively, our imports from France averaged about 10½ millions sterling; and in 1861, previous to the Treaty showing its effects, and when our imports, exports, and re-exports from and to France about balanced each other, our imports had reached about 17

millions; but in 1868, when the Treaty had been in force about nine years, the imports from France reached the sum of $34\frac{1}{2}$ millions sterling, being an increase over the average of the first three years of upwards of 24 millions; while in 1868 our British exports to France only exceeded our exports on the average of 1855-6-7, by £4,414,166, and our re-exports about 10 millions more than the first three years.

But, in a national point of view, it is to the exports of our own British productions that we have to look, as regards our commercial existence. We have been fostering the interest of the foreigner too much, in preference to our own, and we now find ourselves almost shut out of his market, and inundated with his productions in our home trade; and thus our foreign commercial policy generally, and especially with France, has become most destructive to the labour and capital of this kingdom, as evidenced in the following table:—

IMPORTS FROM, AND BRITISH EXPORTS TO, FRANCE IN 1868,
FROM THE BOARD OF TRADE RETURNS.

Imports from France.....	£34,584,343
British Exports to.....	10,633,721
	£23,950,622

Our imports from France, which consists, in a great measure, of competing productions, exceeding our exports to France of British productions by about 24 millions sterling. This is more than the whole value of our total exports of woollen, worsted, and silk manufactures to the whole world; and to give some idea of the vastness of the manufacturing powers of France, I give the total exports from France to all countries of the following important productions in 1868:—

EXPORTS FROM FRANCE IN 1868.

Silk Manufactures.....	£17,935,214
Millinery.....	7,424,283
Cotton Manufactures.....	1,494,612
Woollen and Worsted Manufactures.	11,942,515
Linen Manufactures.....	720,987
	£39,517,611

To further show the rapid stride that France is making in manufactures, the following is also from the Board of Trade returns:—

BRITISH EXPORTS TO FRANCE IN 1866 AND 1868.

MANUFACTURED GOODS.

	1866.	1868.
	yds.	yds.
Cotton Manufactures	56,343,372	38,593,729
Linen “	5,637,477	3,572,756
Woollen and worsted	30,106,684	17,028,250
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	92,087,533	59,194,735
	59,194,735	
	<hr/>	
Decreased Goods	32,892,798	

YARNS.

	1866.	1868.
	lbs.	lbs.
Cotton Yarn	4,083,919	3,988,538
Linen Yarn	2,734,207	3,003,713
Woollen and Worsted Yarn.....	1,983,606	6,928,738
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	8,801,732	13,920,989
	.	<hr/>
		8,801,732
		<hr/>
Increase Yarn.....		5,119,257

In addition to which we have exported to France, in 1868, upwards of 6½ million pounds of Raw Wool.

The total of the foreign trade in 1868 was:—

	£.
Imports of Merchandise into France for consumption.....	135,942,800
French exports to foreign countries.....	116,271,200
	<hr/>
Excess of imports.....	19,671,600

While our foreign trade shows the following results:—

	£.
Total imports into Great Britain in 1868	295,511,566
Total exports of British productions	179,463,644
	<hr/>
Excess of imports	116,047,922

Showing that France looks more to her *exports*, the products of her own industry, for her prosperity; while we think more of our *imports*, the fruits of foreign industry,

than the productions of our own labour and capital. Can we really afford to be so generous?

Now, before I close, I wish to call special attention to the important fact that the wages of France, as regards printed calicoes, are about 30 per cent less than ours, and they put a duty upon the imports of our prints into France of 15 per cent *ad valorem*; and this may be taken as a fair specimen of what we have to contend against with our foreign manufacturing competitors, both in Europe and America. And a still more important view of the commercial position of England and France in reference to their different policies, is shown in the following figures:—

BULLION IN THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

Sep. 7th, 1844.—£15,209,000	Increase.	Decrease.
Jan. 8th, 1853.—£20,527,000	5,318,000	
Apr. 7th, 1869.—£17,225,000		0,302,000

BULLION IN THE BANK OF FRANCE.

Sep. 25th, 1844.—£10,885,000	Increase.	Decrease.
Jan. 13th, 1853.—£20,017,948	9,132,948	
Apr. 7th, 1869.—£47,102,112	27,084,164	

From this, there can be little mystery as to what becomes of our bullion, and for what purposes it is withdrawn from us.

I trust the preceding pages will have met with an impartial review. Their importance demands most serious consideration at the hands of the commercial community of this country. There cannot exist the least doubt but that our manufacturing position is on the wane. In reference to the cotton trade, the United States and foreign Europe have already more than overtaken us. The number of spindles employed in cotton spinning in this country is estimated at 33 millions, while those of America and foreign Europe are said to be about 35½ millions; and, instead of these countries being, as formerly, to a great extent dependent upon us for a supply of goods, they are actually sending the same description of goods here. The same may be said of almost every article upon which hand or mechanical labour is employed.

If we are to save the country from utter ruin, we must at once apply our best energies to obtain a system of reci-

procuity with all the commercial countries of the world. We do not fear competition, if placed on an equal footing; but to attempt to compete against the hostile tariffs and cheaper labour of the world, with free imports, is the very height of insanity.

By all means let us have Free Trade, but let it be Free Trade in reality, or the nearest approach to it we can obtain, viz., reciprocity. Free Trade is a free exchange of commodities. This at present we have not got.

Instead of the promised prosperity, prophetically depicted from the various reductions in our customs tariffs since 1852, the following is the actual result:—

PAUPERISM IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

AMOUNT DISTRIBUTED IN ACTUAL RELIEF TO THE POOR.

1853.....	£4,939,064	} Tariff reduced by Mr. Gladstone previous to the American war.
1860.....	5,454,964	
1861-2.....	} 6,201,820... Annual average during the same.	
1863-4... ..		
1868.....	7,500,000... Nine years after the French Treaty.	

And, at the present moment, about 1 in every 18 of the population of England and Wales is in receipt of parochial relief. The poor-rate in Scotland, imposed in 1845, has risen from £295,000 to £863,000; and, in London alone, the amount expended in relief, in 1859, was £117,935, while in 1868 it was £279,898.

Since the reduction of our tariff by Mr. Gladstone, in 1853, upwards of 3 millions of our people have emigrated from the United Kingdom, and principally to extreme protective countries, in which their labour has found a more remunerative reward for themselves; but, at the same time, it has served to increase the foreign competition against England.

Since the first edition of this pamphlet was published the state of the cotton trade has been as follows:—

“Manchester Guardian,” July 13th, 1869.

THE TRADE OF PRESTON.—It is not within living memory that the trade of Preston was ever so bad as it is at present. All branches of trade, wholesale and retail, are suffering to the same extent. Not even during the strikes and lock-outs for which Preston had become notorious, not excepting the great struggle of 1853-4, which lasted seven months—from the 14th October, 1853, till the 2nd May, 1854—or even during the whole course of the cotton famine, were the receipts of retail dealers so small

as now. An old tradesman, of more than 50 years standing, declares that never in his long experience has he seen such a complete stagnation in all branches of trade simultaneously as exists at the present time. Commercial travellers all complain that throughout the cotton districts of Lancashire, but especially in Preston, they never experienced such difficulty in obtaining money or orders. They come here for a day or two, or perhaps three, walk about the town from place to place, and depart without effecting any business whatever. The number of weavers still receiving pay from the funds of the union (2s. and 4s. per week) is larger now than at any time since the conclusion of the strike, and the same remark applies to the Spinners and Minders' Association. This society continues to send out from five or six persons per week to America.

"Manchester Courier," July 14th, 1869.

POOR RELIEF AND ITS ADMINISTRATION AT PRESTON.—It was reported yesterday at the meeting of the guardians of the Preston Union that there had been relieved during the week 2,844 persons, being an increase of 68 as compared with last week, and of 869 as compared with the corresponding period of last year. The guardians have 144 persons in their employ at the new workhouse, oakum-room, and stone-yard, which number is 15 more than last week.—Mr. Cane, the Poor-law inspector for the northern district, attended the board meeting yesterday, and in the course of some remarks he made alluded to the administration of relief. He said that he had that morning visited the committee which had the largest number of persons to look after. He saw before them persons of all classes, young and aged, and observed amongst the applicants for relief persons whose cleanliness and decency of appearance and manner showed that they would not have come before the committee except under the pressure of distress.

"Manchester Evening News," July 14th, 1869.

As an indication of the times, we may illustrate the offer last evening of an excellent mill and new machinery situated at Heywood, of about 36,000 spindles, all in good order and working condition. The reserve bid was £35,000: the highest offer at the sale was £16,000. Another example that the cotton trade is either overdone or is following "Free-Trade" to the continent, where cheaper labour, mills running night and day, and the help of protective duties are damaging the trade of generous and suffering England.

July 15th.—If they (the manufacturers) would devote their *cacoethes scribendi* to ventilating the question of the working of Free Trade as far as Lancashire is concerned, the overplus of machinery, the surplus of labour, the imperative duty of the Government to help and encourage cotton growing in our own colonies, they would then be doing the cotton trade some service.

Can nothing be done to get us out of such a deplorable position as this? The distress is not confined to the cotton trade alone. The woollen, linen, silk, iron, and all other trades, wherein labour is employed in this kingdom, are suffering from the effects of Foreign competition, and are depressed beyond measure.

The position, both of employers and employed, is truly distressing. If the country is to be saved from utter ruin, we must adopt a different policy to that which we are at present pursuing; and the lukewarmness displayed by the Government, on a subject of such vital importance, is truly astonishing. A sample of this may be seen in Mr. Otway's reply to Mr. Hermon, the member for Preston.

House of Commons, July 12th, 1869.

THE DUTIES ON COTTON GOODS IN FRANCE.

In reply to Mr. Hermon,

Mr. Otway said that there had been no communications with the French Government with respect to the high duties levied on cotton goods imported in France. The duties on which cottons were admitted into France and this country respectively, were fixed by the commercial Treaty.

Was not Mr. Otway aware that, long before the French Treaty, French goods were admitted into this country *duty free*, and the only advantage we gained was, the duties upon our goods going into France being reduced to 15 per cent. *ad valorem*.

This, in fact, has given comparatively little or no relief to this country, France being at this moment an exporter of cotton, woollen, and silks to Great Britain duty free, while their duties are almost prohibitory.

Here is another instance of official indifference:—

House of Commons, July 8th, 1869.

SPANISH TRADE.

In reply to Mr. Akroyd,

Mr. Otway said that the Spanish Government had intimated its desire to enter into a treaty of commerce with this country, and one of the bases proposed was the reduction of the duty on Spanish wines. The question was still under the consideration of the Government, and an answer had not yet been returned to the Spanish Government.

If Spain is wishful to form a commercial treaty with us why does not the Government at once reply to it and endeavour to obtain a reduction or repeal of the duties levied upon our goods going into that country? It is capable of consuming an immense amount of our manufactures.

If this be a fair sample of the indifference of the Government to the distressing position of our industrial interests, the sooner this country arouses itself the better, and endeavours to obtain a revision of foreign tariffs, even if we

have, on their refusal to meet us upon *reciprocal* terms, to reimpose, in self defence, custom duties on the import of foreign manufactures into this kingdom.

It is almost universally admitted that we have been far too liberal in our foreign policy, and although it may have been done with the best intentions, still, after more than twenty years of expectancy on our part, the foreigner has not conceded to us anything like reciprocal advantages; and, however repugnant it may be to reverse our policy, unless the foreigner will reduce his duties to an equitable standard, we must, to save this country from inevitable ruin, impose duties upon the import of foreign manufactures, at any rate equal to the taxation that we levy upon our own productions, for, as the employment of labour decreases from foreign competition, our poor-rates must increase in order to support the unemployed.

I here give a sample of Foreign tariffs:—

DUTIES IMPOSED UPON BRITISH MANUFACTURES IN
AUSTRIA AND RUSSIA.

	Austria.			Russia.			
	Per cwt.				Per cwt.			
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.	
Iron and Steel Wire	0	8	1½	0	14	8	
Zinc, in sheets	0	1	6	0	5	11	
Cotton Yarn	{	0	8	1½	1	11	11½
	{	0	18	3	2	1	7½
Flax and hemp	{	0	1	6	1	19	2
	{	0	12	2			
Woollen.....	{	0	1	6	}	2	4	1
	{	0	12	2				
Cotton Goods.....	{	1	10	5	5	9	8
	{	8	2	6	23	11	4
Linen of Flax or Hemp.	{	0	12	2	2	18	0
	{	7	2	4	12	14	7
Silk Goods.....	{	6	2	0	19	13	1
	{	12	4	0	98	5	10
Paper for writing and	{	0	2	0	0	19	8
printing.....	{	0	12	2	3	18	8
Saddlery.....	{	0	12	2	}	7	16	3
	{	1	1	4				
Glass Wares	{	0	1	6	0	4	11
	{	0	12	2	3	18	8
Earthenware	{	0	5	0¾	0	7	5
	{	0	12	2	7	17	3
Needles, sewing.....		1	10	5	9	16	7
Fire-arms.....		1	10	5	8	16	11

RECAPITULATION.

Two conclusions, we think, may fairly be drawn from the statements in the foregoing pages, viz: that, under the present system, the chance of keeping our workmen in full employment diminishes every day, and that this country is in the position of a person who overspends his income. In private life when a man does so, unless he is in possession of a large fortune, he soon goes to the wall; and it is only the wealth of this country, to begin with, which has prevented the effects of the system being more plainly and immediately seen.

The system now in vogue consists in giving every encouragement to the introduction of the produce of other countries; while these countries do everything in their power to encourage their own manufactures, and to prevent the introduction of ours, by the imposition of hostile tariffs.

By admitting into our home market foreign manufactures free from duty, in competition with our own, which have to bear their proportion of imperial taxation, such as poor-rates, &c., from which foreign manufactures are exempt; and, in addition to that, having our own manufactures excluded from the market of our competitors by the imposition of heavy duties, we actually give a bonus to our foreign competitors against ourselves in the competition of the world, and foster foreign industry in opposition to our own.

Take France as an example. We allow her calicoes, silks, &c., to come into this country duty free, while she imposes import duties of 15 per cent. and upwards upon articles of the same kind of our manufacture.

There is another important point to be considered. The principal exports of this country to France consist of raw material, or goods upon which comparatively little labour is bestowed, and which therefore give comparatively little employment to our workmen; while those of France consist (exclusive of wine, &c.) of articles the labour expended upon which constitutes the largest proportion of the value.

On reference to the page 12, showing our exports to, and imports from, France, it is particularly worthy of notice that, comparing the two periods, 1866 with 1868, we find that France took 32 million yards *less* of our manufactures in 1868 than in 1866, and that the only increase was in yarn, on which the minimum amount of labour has been expended: thus showing in this one example the injurious effects of this Treaty on our working classes. Further than this. When the importation of raw material to this country might have been serviceable to us, as in the case of rags, they take care to impose *export* duties which totally prevent our deriving any benefit from them, thereby enhancing the cost of the production of paper in this country, and rendering our paper manufacturers less able to compete with them; while we, with unparalleled generosity, admit paper of their manufacture entirely free.

Can anything be conceived more iniquitous and unfair than this? In fact, they look to their own interest alone, quite regardless of what would be only common justice to us.

It is well worthy of notice that, with every reduction of our import duties on foreign manufactures, the amount of pauperism has increased in a similar ratio, as is clearly shown by referring to the accompanying table, issued by the Poor-Law Board in their last returns. (See page 15.) About one person in eighteen of the population of England and Wales, is, irrespective of Scotland, entirely supported by the rates, and the numbers are still increasing. What an accumulation of misery does this show, when we consider that, in addition to these, there are multitudes on the verge of starvation.

Duties, imposed by other countries for the purpose of revenue, do us little injury when these countries do not compete with our manufacturing industry. This puts most of our colonies on a different footing from such a country as France, and many others. Canada may tax our calicoes and our prints without doing us much injury; but, when the United States, with its large productive power, imposes duties of, in some cases, 50 per cent. upon our manufactures, it is time to look about us, more especially when

we bear in mind that our formerly gigantic trade with that country in such articles is now almost completely annihilated.

They say that they impose these duties for the purpose of revenue and to enable them to pay off their national debt.

Might not this plan of looking after their own interests be beneficial to others as well as to them ?

Without expressing any opinion as to the policy of the course they are now pursuing, we merely notice that, quite contrary to the anticipations of many prophets in this country, they are honorably paying off their debts with a rapidity which is quite marvellous, whilst we are doing next to nothing in the same direction. In reference to this see *The Times* report of the House of Commons for August :

Mr. Lambert next moved a resolution calling on the House to take steps gradually to reduce the National Debt ; and for this purpose he suggested a shilling income-tax, which, producing £25,000,000 a year, would entirely sweep away this incubus in something over 30 years.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reply, pointed out that the resolution was useless, as it had only affirmed a policy on which Parliament had long been acting ; and in proof of this he mentioned that between 1859 and 1860 the National Debt had been reduced from £832,843,000 to £795,000,000, at the rate of about £3,782,000 a year.

This amount of reduction, *i. e.*, £3,700,000 per annum is equal to 9s. per cent. per annum ; whereas, if our system of taxing ourselves, for the advantage of the foreigner, was put an end to, Mr. Lambert's suggestion might be carried out, as the additional taxation could be easily raised out of the profits of our trade.

Let it be borne in mind that as all articles of foreign manufacture are admitted into this country duty free, thus displacing the produce of our own industry, which has to bear the burden of our taxation, they consequently bear no portion of this taxation. We, therefore, by our present system are paying a portion of the taxes of the foreigner as well as our own. Is it not time, then, for the commercial men of England, employer and employed alike (for do not they both live by the profits of the same industry ?), to rise up as one man to put an end to this ruinous system, and while it is yet time to save themselves and the country from ruin ?

How is it with Germany? At one time we had a much larger German trade in many articles than we have now. Take printed goods as an example. This trade was done largely through Hamburgh. Since its incorporation with Prussia, it, along with the other conquests of that country, has been compelled to join the Zollverein, and duties are imposed on our manufactured goods which are practically prohibitory.

It has been estimated by parties who are competent to give an opinion, that we have, by hostile tariffs, been excluded from trading with countries representing over 60 millions of people, and that mostly, if not entirely, since the inauguration of our so-called Free Trade policy.

Our trade with Russia and Austria, so far as our manufacturing industry is concerned, is in much the same position as it is with Germany, occasioned by the imposition of hostile tariffs; and, by our one-sided policy, we are inducing these countries to extend and increase their manufacturing industry, sending their manufactures into this country, free from duty, to compete with our own.

The manufacturers and other employers of labour in this district, with the immense capital previously invested in mills and machinery, the stoppage of which involves always a large and certain loss, inspired with the hope of better times, and, to a great extent, from a feeling of compassion towards the poor people in their employment, have been reluctant to face the position of discharging their workpeople, except at the last extremity. The result is that the capital invested in mills, machinery, &c. has deteriorated to less than one-fourth of its original value, as is well known in this district. Therefore, nothing can be more fallacious than the conclusions sometimes drawn from the Board of Trade returns. The large amount of exports to certain countries is given as a proof of our commercial prosperity; while the fact is, that the stoppage of the exports of our manufactures to the European and American markets, as already pointed out, has forced our manufacturers into consignments on a large scale to the markets still left open—in many cases at a ruinous loss, as recent and almost daily failures plainly show. Hence

the markets still open to us get glutted with our goods, to the grievous injury of our merchants, manufacturers, and workpeople, as all in this district know to their sorrow.

These facts are well known to all parties on the Manchester Exchange, though not recognised as they ought to be by writers for the London press.

In the money article in the London *Times* of July 28th, it is stated that an error has been detected in the figures of the Board of Trade returns.

It is now feared that our exports of cotton goods alone have been over-estimated in those returns to the enormous extent of twenty millions sterling. If this is a fact, it proves more strongly in what a frightful position the industry of this district is placed, and how ruinously the balance of trade with foreign countries is against us.

Since the publication of the 1st edition of this pamphlet, my attention has been drawn to a tract just issued, entitled—"Free Trade a Gigantic Mistake," by James Roberts, London,—from which, as some portions of its contents bear on the subject treated of in this pamphlet, I furnish some extracts:—

Unless we speedily adopt a more selfish and more natural course of action and resolve to be just before we are generous, before coming forth as philanthropists of the universe, we should see after our own starving families—before trying to give trade to others, we should see that we have enough for ourselves. It is beautiful in theory to be so noble, so disinterested, so valiant, as to do battle with the universe; but it is hard, very hard, in practice. We are all now suffering from a kind of wide-spread stoppage of trade, which no one attempts to account for, but hopes it will be better soon, and that "things may take a turn."

We do not believe in a permanent state of improvement under our present so-called Free-Trade policy; but, on the contrary, we believe that Free Trade solely adopted by England is a "gigantic mistake" and, had it not been for the gold discovered, the whole would have exploded long since.

It is no satisfaction to those who have not a single penny in their pockets, and cannot get one, to be told that certain things are cheaper. It is only aggravating to read statistics and hear that the exports and imports have marvellously increased, and yet thousands upon thousands cannot get their daily bread; that panics and failures amongst merchants are not at all uncommon; that there have been periodical difficulties which have attacked nearly every trade, and, by which, each in its turn has been unaccountably depressed, and those dependent upon it for support complaining of their hard fate, heavy losses, ruin, want of employment, and so on according to the position of the individuals. Yet, with

all this misery, it is stated that our trade is increasing. Granted, that there is more trade in 1867 than there was in 1847 (so there ought to be), we may have exported and imported more in the aggregate; but, if the exports are principally *raw material*, the demand for labour does not increase with the increase of this kind of trade: then what great advantage can the increase in this warehousing trade confer on our citizens, deprived as they have been by our legislation of what had been all but a monopoly? The opportunity of employing British labour upon it, to prepare it for the foreign market of which we would still have possession, had we not heedlessly thrown away our advantage.

But we altogether leave the theory of what is called Free Trade, and are reducing it to the result of practice. We argue that there is stagnation in trade, and that the labouring classes, in many trades, are without work to do, because of the introduction of foreign manufactures duty free; and the very fact of their being unable to obtain work at all times, and constantly, is one of the reasons which tends to produce strikes. When workmen are on full and good wages, and in constant employment, they are generally too well satisfied to place themselves out of employment; but when they find that they are only employed at the caprice of the master, or it may be at the caprice of his customers, and at the moment they are not required they are discharged, they naturally come to the very proper conclusion that they should do as well as they can with the power they possess, in times when there is a scarcity of that material which they alone can supply—that is to say, when the caprice, or fancy, or will, of the masters and their customers, demands strict and close attention, so that large supplies may be at once produced for the fitful emergency. It is not to be wondered that the workmen should, in such exigencies, make attempts to exact a higher price during the temporary excitement, rather than if they were daily at work, upon a uniform scale in every way; what can be more fair? what more just? These workmen have suffered during the time of want of work, and consequent starvation: are they not to be permitted to make up for their lost time, and to regain what they have lost in adverse times? It is an outrage against common sense that legislation should dare to prohibit the exercise of the fair right of labour: if so, and if we would support any such measure, we are introducing slavery into England.

Merchants combine together to uphold the price of articles of commerce and consumption, and supply capital to each other to uphold their determination to bind themselves together for their mutual good; and the consequence is that the price of articles so protected, runs up to prices most unsatisfactory to the consumer; but the law does not interfere with them. Upon what grounds, then, should the labourer be urged or compelled to work at less than he has made up his mind to take? And why should not workmen equally combine to protect themselves, and all they possess, which is their labour, or the price of it? I conceive, in the absence of any written contract or binding agreement, workmen should be free to do as they please with their own.

It is absurd and ridiculous to say that the reason why England cannot compete with other countries is simply because the demand of the British workman is greater now than it was formerly. There can be no doubt that the greater number of articles which the workman and his

family require for their consumption, has advanced in price during the last twenty years; and he, consequently, to obtain what he formerly did, requires an advance of wages.

Notwithstanding all our intentions, the population of the world goes on increasing with such marvellous rapidity, that the increase should give an increasing and a prosperous trade to all those who can contribute to the supplies required; and there is no chance of this increase of population being checked; but, on the contrary, it is perfectly certain that every year will add to the aggregate population more and more; so that enormous quantities of everything required now, will bear nothing to enormous quantities that will be required in the future. Whether England will be the manufacturer of these requirements depends entirely upon herself, or the way in which she proceeds. If a shopkeeper voluntarily gives up his business in favour of another, for a few years, he need not be surprised that he loses that business altogether, and that when he is desirous of commencing afresh, he need not imagine that he will find himself able to compete with those who have taken up his place. Things change as years roll on; and, if once we lose the lead, we shall find it most difficult to regain it. The more business we have, the more does it flow to us; but this applies equally to the foreigner; consequently, if we encourage him to enter into competition with us in all other countries, we may eventually find that he can beat us in our own, and this discovery, we regret to say, is now pressing itself upon our notice.

But the great question with us is—Who wants Free Trade in his own trade? Because, if no one wants it in his own particular trade, and if no one can see a benefit to arise to his own department of trade, by a Free-Trade policy, how can it benefit a nation that lives by trade?

England, being the first to adopt such a policy, has opened her ports to the introduction of every kind of manufacture and production, and, with the exception of a very few, they are now permitted to be imported into England, either for home consumption or for re-export, without any customs or other duty being charged by this country. The effect of this is that the manufactures of almost every country are now forwarded to England, and the whole of the price at which they are sold may go into the pockets of the foreign producer, less only the cost of freight and landing charges. Now it seems plain that if all these articles had been manufactured in England, the British revenue would have received a considerable amount in direct or indirect taxation through the expenditure, during the time it took to manufacture them, of those who worked to produce them; while the foreign producer has not in any way contributed to the support of this country. It appears, therefore, that the foreign manufacturer has an evident advantage over the British producer to the extent of the taxes paid by the latter; and, as the price we pay for all articles of foreign make, when legitimately sold, includes the cost for labour, material, freight charges, and the taxes paid by the foreigner in his own country, it follows that we pay a portion of the foreign taxation as well as our own; and at the same time we reduce the value of British labour from what it would be if a natural course were pursued.

Now we should prefer that the introduction of foreign manufactures into England should only be permitted free when there is reciprocity or

some important necessity for it; and, therefore, that as we possess the power to erect machinery for the production of an almost unlimited quantity of goods of every kind, and that as we possess sufficient skill and labour to supply all our wants, it is an injustice to ourselves to admit those outside our own family to participate in the benefits of our extended trade, carried out and protected by a gradually-increasing and most expensive government, unless we charge them, at all events, a duty sufficient to equalise taxation on all producers, whether foreign or domestic. We do not find that any country has attempted to follow us in our resolve, more generous and quixotical than wise, to let every one compete with us.

What, then, is to be the future of England? and how is she to live? Is it to be supposed that England can exist for any given number of years without labour? We maintain that she cannot. Her resources are great; her wealth enormous; but will this wealth, or the interest of the capital alone, and the expenditure thereof, keep the whole of the people? We assert that it will not. We have the bare fact before us that seventy millions must be annually expended in the importation of food alone from foreign countries. England cannot exist on her own agriculture, because she not only consumes all she grows herself, but she must import millions in addition for food alone, and which it seems is expended in the following way:—

Cattle.....	5½ millions.
Butter.....	9 “
Meat.....	3 “
Corn.....	30 “
	—
	47½ “

While the imports of the other great necessities are:—

Tea and Sugar.....	20 millions.
Spirits.....	2½ “
Wines.....	5 “
Tobacco.....	2½ “
	—

Making a grand total of..... 77½ “

Can England exist on the interest of the money she has loaned to foreign countries, great as that amount is? We argue that she cannot. Can England exist by importing and exporting raw produce? We argue that, although a great number may exist by that means, that this alone will not support so great a number of people; nor will agriculture and the interest of her money together, enable her to exist with an annual government expenditure of 70 millions—which has been yearly increasing.

Whence, then, is her revenue to be derived? The answer is, from her manufacturing industry. Why, then, discourage the manufacturing industry upon which, as is thus clearly proved, chiefly depends the existence of the people? England must mainly depend upon her manufacturing powers, and everything that tends to restrict the extension of her manufacturing industry is injurious. Not only ought we not to discourage, but we are compelled, for bare existence, to support

and increase all our manufacturing industries. It is not our policy, under such circumstances, to encourage competition, although even it might benefit a few; for we have to look after the interests of the nation at large, and to the well-doing of every individual who lives by his industry in manufactures—the future of England depends upon it. Arouse ye, then, English operatives, and endeavour to support your own, even at the expense of others. To be cosmopolitan is to bring ruin to your own homes; for, no matter what the energy of the people may be, one country with open ports cannot fight one hundred countries with closed ones, and be successful in the engagement. Close your ports to manufacturers who do not reciprocate, and you will have real Free Trade in one year.

“Sir Robert Peel, in the debate on Free Trade, was met by Mr. Disraeli with the following very proper question. The latter asked Sir Robert Peel:—

“‘Are you prepared to combat hostile tariffs with free imports?’

“Mr. Disraeli evidently then saw that to open the ports of England would not cause other countries to follow that example. His question now comes home to us, and we must now, from our practical experience of the results of Free Trade, openly and candidly admit that we cannot ‘combat hostile tariffs.’ To support this view of the case, we have the authority of the ironmasters, with reference to the recent extra ‘hostile tariff on iron.’

“America has chosen to increase duties on foreign manufactures, so that she may supply the demand for labour for her own people as much as possible. By this means she will encourage the manufacture of iron in her own country; while we are totally unable to do without American produce imported into this country, a great proportion of which consists of breadstuffs and cotton, on which we have so much relied, she will buy less of our iron.”

I am entirely unacquainted with the writer of the above, and, in fact, never heard of his name before his pamphlet was put into my hands. Without expressing an opinion as to the correctness of his views, either favourable or otherwise, I must admit that it is ably written, his arguments most logically and forcibly put. It is the production of a man evidently of considerable ability, and is addressed mainly to the educated classes.

The publication is well worth the careful perusal of all parties who are interested in the subject. I therefore

earnestly recommend it to the reader of this pamphlet. It can be procured from John Heywood, 141 and 143, Deansgate; Cornish, 33, Piccadilly, Manchester.

We were told by the great advocates of our one-sided Free-Trade policy, that if we only set the example of opening our ports, other countries would quickly follow.

We gave them our cheap coals, cheap iron, and allowed the export of our machinery free from duty, also lending our capital to enable them to make their railways, and, in fact, gave everything that we had to give. What return have they made to us for all this generosity? The imposition of almost prohibitory duties, deluging our markets with their own productions, admitted into this country duty free, and as far as lay in their power excluding our manufacturers from theirs. Some sanguine persons anticipate that a large increase in the supply of cotton will relieve us from all our troubles. This may improve our position for a limited time, by the increased demand for cotton goods in neutral markets; but, as our foreign rivals will be exactly in the same position as ourselves as to the supply of cotton, and with so many markets closed against our productions, we shall speedily revert to the same unfortunate position we are in at the present time.

Now, I wish to draw the attention of the reader to a leader written by the able "Paris Correspondent" of the *Manchester Examiner and Times*, one of the leading Liberal journals of this city, on the Paris Exhibition and French Treaty, written as far back as 1867, which is well worthy of perusal, as showing most forcibly the unfairness and inequality of the present policy towards our producing classes, employer and employed alike:—

*From the Paris Correspondent of the "Manchester Examiner and Times,"
June, 1867.*

It is time I made some remarks on the staple trade of the district, how in its different branches it is represented in this exhibition, how it compares with the displays from other cotton districts, especially with France, and what are its commercial prospects in the French market. But, before entering on this subject, it will be well to understand a little more of the mutual commercial relations between the two countries than is usually known, and to look a little carefully into the results of the treaty, of which we have had now, in six years, time and data to form a judgment. When Cobden undertook that great work, there were no very distinct data on which to go. An exaggerated and almost lunatic

conception of the outrageous cheapness of English goods prevailed in France, and was appealed to and taken advantage of by the monopolist manufacturers. Among English merchants and manufacturers an almost equally crazy, if somewhat less exaggerated, idea prevailed that, if duties similar to and, if possible, less than those in the States could be obtained, an immense market would open at their doors. The latter forgot that the French, though living under a system of strict prohibition of English goods generally, yet manage to be quite sufficiently clad and housed with their own manufactures: in this, totally unlike the States, Italy, Spain, &c. The former speaking, or rather yelling, in their excited selfishness, through the mouths of Pouyer Quartier, Mimerel, and Co., in the Chamber, shut their ears to all facts and reasons, and blindly shouted for heavy duties. I don't think the only simple and business-like data on which a correct judgment could have been formed in regard to the real position, an independent and correctly-priced sampling of the manufactures of both countries, was ever properly made and authoritatively appealed to, or the wild alarms of the French and the quiet confidence of the English would have been considerably modified, and more reasonable duties, at all events as regards cottons, would have been provided for ere this date in the treaty. My own impression, on pricing French calicoes, six months before the Treaty, was that certain classes were actually cheaper than similar descriptions by our first and largest makers; and, on sending over a few hundred pieces of greys to Manchester, they, to the surprise of every one in the trade, sold readily at a profit, and were the precursors of the large importations of French calicoes which have followed since.

Amid our annual flourishes of trumpets over the increasing greatness of our French trade, I don't know that we ever look even roughly into its component elements and their relative importance. I will take some figures on the subject from French Government statistics, as they give the actual consumption of our imports, and the export of their own products and manufactures; whereas our Board of Trade tables give, as exported to France, all that is shipped for French ports, much of which is only in transit for Germany, Switzerland, and Spain; and as imports from France, much of which, though coming from French ports, is not of French origin at all. In 1865 (the tables for 1866 are not yet out), the total imports into France from England were $29\frac{1}{2}$ millions, of which $25\frac{1}{2}$ went into consumption: the exports from France into England were 53 millions, of which over 40 were French products and manufactures. We see, then, which of the two countries is the greatest producer and exporter; and an analysis of the relative amounts will still further show how differently from what was expected the Treaty has developed trade. Of the $25\frac{1}{2}$ millions of English imports no less than 18 are raw materials ($\frac{7}{8}$ foreign produce, $\frac{1}{8}$ coal) paying an average duty of $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent., except coal, $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; four millions are half-raw materials, of which over $\frac{1}{4}$ is yarn, paying $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty, and nearly half-colonial produce, paying 30 per cent. duty, except cigars (a government monopoly), $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; and out of the $25\frac{1}{2}$ millions sterling, not three are British manufactures, which paid an average duty of 10 per cent. from $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on potteries and glass, 20 on cutlery, 16 on timber, 13 on cottons, to $7\frac{1}{2}$ on metal works, and 1 per cent. on

silks. But of the 40 millions sterling of French products imported into England, 6 only are raw materials and 12 half-raw, all home produce, while no less than 21 millions are manufactures, imported duty free, against the 3 millions of ours, admitted grudgingly into France under heavy duties.

Now, without enlarging on this great disparity of positions, or thinking for a moment of reversing or narrowing that Free-Trade policy which we have recognised as logically just, and which in this case enables France to send us in 21 millions of her manufactures, while she shuts out all but 3 millions of ours, I think we may at least say that the position thus revealed by the figures of the French Government itself, as made to French industry by the Treaty of Commerce, is not one which can be honourably maintained, at all events towards us. . . . To continue to import into our markets without duty, and without even a prejudice, and yet to shut out our cottons by duties of 10, 15, and 20 per cent., which are prohibitions rather than duties, would be to take a mean and unmanly advantage of our adoption of a large and noble principle. Whatever wrathful howls the unlimited selfishness of the monopolist leaders may be shameless enough to utter, the nation and government it seems to me, cannot honourably continue such duties, so purely inimical and so evidently unnecessary. Besides, the cotton duties have remained, since the beginning of the Treaty, unchanged, while those on woollen cloths, Bradford goods, carpets, &c., have been reduced from 15 to 10 per cent., a reduction which has, in some of these goods, served to maintain, with great difficulty, a comparatively feeble trade; and the absence of which reduction, as regards cotton maintains an absolute prohibition. If all this does not constitute a case for action on the part of the leading authorities of your cotton districts, either directly on the French Government, or indirectly through the Board of Trade, I hardly know what would.

But we will not content ourselves with the merely general figures quoted above—we will analyse these totals, at least as far as regards textile manufactures, and see the details of each sort imported and exported. These I give in French figures, that is, in millions of francs, since, as regards the small import of manufactures, we cannot descend into details, and maintain as a unit of calculation that pleasant round sum, a million of pounds.

LEADING MANUFACTURES EXPORTED FROM FRANCE TO ALL PARTS,
NATIONAL PRODUCTS ONLY.

	1860.	1861.	1862.	1863.	1864.	1865.
Silks	454·8	333·3	363·5	370·3	408·2	428·5
Woollens	229·3	188·0	221·7	293·6	355·9	302·8
Cottons	69·6	56·4	63·3	88·2	93·7	93·5
Linens	15·4	14·9	14·7	19·0	24·5	25·2
Yarns, cotton, wool, linen	12·6	9·2	17·3	43·7	43·1	35·4
Dresses, mercery, } umbrellas, furniture, } all more or less the } above manufactures } made up.....	202·0	172·7	235·3	242·0	305·2	326·0
	983·7	774·5	915·8	1056·8	1230·6	1211·4

LEADING MANUFACTURES IMPORTED INTO FRANCE FROM ALL PARTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

	1860.	1861.	1862.	1863.	1864.	1865.
Silks	3·9	4·1	4·5	4·6	7·1	11·3
Wool and worsted threads.	7·4	26·5	47·7	39·2	37·7	43·5
Cottons	0·8	9·4	14·3	8·7	9·5	10·5
Linens	11·6	13·9	13·5	12·5	14·3	13·3
Yarns, cotton, wool, linen	4·7	11·6	26·0	25·5	23·9	34·2
Dresses, mercery, &c., nil, or nearly so.....	—	—	—	—	—	—
	28·4	65·5	106·0	90·5	92·5	112·8

“In order to show the effect of the Treaty, I have begun with the year previous to its coming into force, but a good deal of the small imports of 1860 are already due to it. The insignificance of the imports as compared to the exports is remarkable, the total imports being only a tenth part of the exports. Of these exports the great bulk always comes to England, and the rest goes to markets in which they compete successfully with our goods. Even in cotton goods, there is hardly an article of which the French do not send us in much more than they take. In grey and bleached calicoes, while they take from us for 19 millions of francs, they send us in for nearly 22 millions; in prints they take 620,000 francs, and send us for three millions; in dyed goods they take 160,000 francs, and send us for over one million; in muslins they take 353,000 francs, and send us over one million; in hosiery they take 57,000 francs, and send us half a million; and so with several other smaller articles. And yet, while sending these comparatively large quantities into our markets, without duty and without question, they still maintain against our goods heavy inimical duties and all the force of strongly-prejudiced opinions.”

It is idle to suppose that we shall have any concession from the generosity of the foreigner. The present system pays him too well. He has the markets of England, the largest and best markets in the world, open to his productions, free from duty, in addition to his own, from which he carefully excludes us.

He is extending and increasing his manufacturing industries, whilst ours, without scarcely any exception, are greatly on the wane. By the manner in which we have fostered and encouraged his trade to the injury of our own, and the ruin of our working classes, he is now enabled to compete with us for the purchase of raw produce necessary to our manufactures, and can afford to pay a better price than we can pay, and get a profit where we cannot hold our own. For instance, take cotton and madders, and many other articles, which would now have been comparatively cheap had it not been for the competition of the foreigner, whose interests are protected at home by the imposition of heavy duties.

A staunch Liberal, and strong Free-Trader, of this city, referring to our present system of Free Trade, made the pertinent remark that it was simply allowing the foreigner to plunder our pockets with one hand, while with the other he carefully buttoned up his own.

It is now necessary to call the attention of the reader to the state of our home trade, the want of employment, and the deplorable condition, from that cause, of the British workmen.

Let us take an extract from Mr. Roberts' pamphlet on this subject:—

In order to explain and account for the injuries to British manufacturing trades, it is necessary that we should show how foreign competition, and the admission of foreign manufactures duty free, are affecting the British workman; and we will now cite cases, by way of illustration, which have come under our notice in a variety of ways, and are very varied in their character.

We find that Millwall, Deptford, Woolwich, and most ship-building ports are comparatively idle—no sailing vessels building—foreign vessels do away with the necessity for British. Trade falls off in the towns of Nottingham, Macclesfield, Stockport, Bolton, Wigan, Oldham, Coventry, Leek, Preston, Manchester, Derby, Congleton, Sandbach, Leighton-Buzzard, Luton, Newport Pagnell, Tring, Exeter, Crediton, and London, and many other places. Ship-building involves thirty other trades; watch making, sixty trades: they are gradually passing from us. The iron trade is losing ground: tools, chairs, pans, spades, hoes, axes, nails, lamps, tin-ware, locks, curry-combs, traps, hinges, brass foundry, needles, hooks, guns, swords, buttons, jewellery, steel pens, trinkets, pins, wire, tubing, scales, cutlery, bronze articles, japanned articles, &c., &c.,

now come from America, France, and Germany. We have doors, window-sashes, and all kinds of woodwork from the Baltic. Foreign agricultural implements, furniture, artificial flowers, baby-linen, dresses, baskets, beads, beds, Berlin work, blankets, bonnets, boots, braid, brushes, candles, canes, common carpets, cardboards, caps, china, glass of every kind, clocks, cloths, damasks, delaine electrotype paper, pencils, fringe, muslin lace, gilded goods, gold and silver articles, hosiery, leather, linen, looking-glasses, lucifers, shoes, silk, ribbons, soap, stationery, stays, steam-engines—in fact everything, small and great,—and all are admitted duty free into England, and on equal terms into our colonies.

Is it, then, any matter of surprise that the British workmen and British manufacturers have no employment? If all these articles were made here, there would be no lack of work for the British workman, and the whole of England would once more be set in motion.

Now this fully accounts for the stagnation of our home trade. The working classes having nothing to do cannot buy (and they are the great consumers), because the favoured foreigner is making what they could do better and would gladly make themselves. The employers, from the losses they are sustaining from the slackness of trade, and wholesale destruction of property, are in the same position.

“Now, what advantage is it to a working man that he can obtain for a shilling a vile decoction called claret, which is not so palatable or wholesome as good English beer, when he cannot earn the shilling to buy it with?”

This, I fancy, is the only advantage accruing to the working man from this system.

Real Free Trade is a free interchange of commodities on equal terms, not the misnomer commonly called Free Trade that we have now. It is not to be credited that the British workman, as a rule, is aware what Free Trade is as we have it, viz., that it is the introduction of foreign manufactures of all kinds free from duty into this country, and the careful exclusion of his own productions from the market of the foreigner.

When this is fully explained to him it will be a wonderful thing to see how he will receive the information; and it is astonishing that the working classes have been blind so long to the true cause of their want of employment and its irregular and fitful nature. It is not in human

nature that men would elect to continue to starve, in order that the Frenchman, the American, German, Austrian, and other foreigners, should prosper by that trade which was the foundation of England's greatness. If our working classes were fully and regularly employed we should hear of no more strikes, which are only a form of protest against our present system. We have submitted to this system for more than 25 years, which is quite long enough for a trial of its effects, and have had little or no response from the foreigner. Let us therefore bring this ruinous experiment to an end, with as little delay as possible. We are glad to see that our representative, Mr. Birley, has given the following notice:—

Mr. Birley gave notice that next session he should call the attention of the house to the commercial Treaty with France, and move for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the effect of the Treaty upon British commerce and manufactures.

and we hope that he will be supported by our other representatives and the country at large, and that, during the recess of Parliament, meetings may be held in every city and town of the United Kingdom in condemnation of our present ruinous foreign policy.

When our Government was endeavouring to negotiate a commercial treaty with Austria, and suggested the advisability of the removal of the heavy duties levied on our manufactures, the inquiry was made—What can you give us in exchange? Our Government replied “Nothing. We have already given you all; we have therefore nothing further to give.” The consequence was that no treaty could be negotiated.

This shows us the mistake we have made and clearly points out our true policy, and the sooner we change our tactics, the sooner our misery will be brought to an end.

Why do we levy £6,500,000 per annum on malt, mostly abstracted from the hard earnings of the working classes, and to the injury of our agricultural interest, for the sake of revenue, at the same time admitting the rich man's champagnes and other wines at a nominal duty?

Why do we also for the sake of revenue levy £9,400,000 per annum on tea, coffee, sugar, &c., the produce of our own customers who do not compete with us in manufacture, these being at the same time articles of paramount necessity to the working classes, at the same time admitting French silks, gloves, and the innumerable articles only purchased by the rich, duty free?

Would it not be more equitable to raise our revenue as far as possible on articles of luxury, which enter into the consumption of the rich, instead of levying black mail on the earnings of the poor, thus diminishing the demand for their labour, to the profit of the foreigner and the non-productive classes of this country?

The passage of the Reform Bill and the Extension of the Franchise to the working classes, have increased their power to an extent that has scarcely been yet realised.

Does any sane man believe that when they are made aware of these facts, they will allow the system to continue?

Will they allow themselves to be fleeced, expelled from the country, or ground down to the continental level as to wages and hours of labour, for the advantage of the non-producing class and the foreigner?

It is an acknowledged fact that the working classes in America, France, and other countries, as a rule, are protectionist at heart. That this is the case in this country, to a certain extent, is sufficiently indicated by the existence of trades unions, and the prevalence of strikes, which are only the demands for protection in another form; and no wonder, when we consider that every sovereign's worth of foreign manufacture admitted into this country duty free deprives the British workman of a proportionate amount of labour.

The employers believe in Free Trade, if on equal terms, but they will not consent to be so weighted in the race of competition for the benefit of the foreigner, who rewards our generosity by excluding our manufactures.

Let us therefore be warned in time, before the inevitable reaction against the present system sets in; let us

be just before we are generous; let us remember that "Charity begins at home;" and, by legislating on the principles of justice and equity, for the interests of our working classes, our suffering fellow-countrymen, instead of consulting altogether the interests of the foreigner, keep this momentous question out of the hands of extreme parties in either direction.

Let us keep off all duties on raw material of all classes used in manufacture; remove the duties levied on articles used for the support of the masses of our population, so far as the exigencies of our revenue will admit, and levy all duties we possibly can on articles of luxury, at the same time boldly giving the foreigner to understand that for the future we shall exact duties on his manufactures to the same amount as he levies on ours, that we are determined to have *reciprocity and nothing less*, that we shall reduce or raise our duties on his manufactures for revenue in the same proportion as he reduces or advances his duties on ours. When this fact is thoroughly recognised and felt by the foreigner, then, and not until then, will the hopes and anticipations of Richard Cobden be fully realised. We may then enjoy the benefits of real Free Trade, instead of the swindle we have now, which has caused, and is causing, so much misery to the producing and industrious classes.

This is not a party question, and has not been so treated by the writer of this pamphlet. Whig and Tory, Radical and Conservative, are all suffering alike from the effects of this ruinous system, and I am fully persuaded that if not quickly altered, it will eventuate in overwhelming in one common ruin every commercial interest in the country.

It has already struck down the silk and ribbon trades of Macclesfield and Coventry, the iron trade districts, and also many minor branches of trade, bringing to poverty and ruin millions of our population. It is now undermining that magnificent industry, the cotton trade, of this district, on which our position as a nation so largely depends.

It behoves all classes of all shades of politics to unite as one man, and sternly to insist on having the causes of our distress enquired into and removed. Let us by every means in our power impress upon our representatives, our firm determination to have justice done to us, and at the next election decline to give our votes and interest to any candidate for our suffrages, whether he be Whig or Tory, Radical or Conservative, who will not pledge himself to assist in putting an end to this iniquitous system.

In this publication the cotton trade alone principally is treated, but the same complaints are made from all sides, and from all branches of trade alike, and from exactly the same cause.

Having been engaged for many years in the collation and preparation of tables of exports and imports for business purposes, and having the same, therefore, constantly under my notice, I was very much impressed at finding how strongly the figures showing the balance of trade with France were telling against this country. I was therefore impelled to raise a note of warning on the subject, as far back as the beginning of 1867. My predictions as time passed by proving, unfortunately, too correct, some gentlemen interested in the subject strenuously urged me to place my views, &c., before the public in its present form. I reluctantly consented. Hence, this pamphlet, which I now lay before my fellow countrymen; and, if I succeed in rousing their attention to the danger of our position, whilst there is yet time, I shall be amply rewarded.

It is necessary to bear in mind that there is no time to lose. The French Treaty expires January, 1870, and twelve months' notice from either side is required before it can be put to an end. Let there be due notice promptly given, and then our legislators will have ample time to negotiate a fresh treaty on the only fair system, *i.e.*, reciprocity.

Let all sincere Free-Traders beware, lest, by denying to our suffering masses *real Free Trade*, or its nearest equivalent, reciprocity, their disgust and exasperation may be so aroused that they may end by demanding and enforcing

Protection. Don't let us be deceived by a mere reduction of duties, but be satisfied *with reciprocity, and nothing less.* What avails it to us if the duties are reduced to 5 per cent. instead of 15 per cent., if the lower duty act equally for the advantage of the French manufacturer, *i. e.*, the exclusion of our productions from his market?

APPENDIX.

“Manchester Examiner,” April 7th, 1869.

THE WOOLLEN MANUFACTURES OF GERMANY.

English woollen manufacturers will soon have to exclude the Germans from the category of their customers; and it is not improbable that they may, ere long, find them, as of yore, again competitors for the woollen trade of the East. Three-quarters of a century ago, when this industry had been almost destroyed by the Thirty Years' War, woollens to the value of nearly 4,500,000 thalers were imported into Germany from England alone. Now it seems that the value of the woollen goods annually exported from Prussia is about 70,000,000 thalers: the entire exports of the Zollverein amount to 380,000,000, so that woollens alone form somewhat more than 18 per cent. of the whole export trade of Germany. This branch of industry employs nearly a quarter of a million of persons: thus, by a very moderate estimate of their families, we shall find that 700,000 persons, or nearly 2 per cent. of the entire population of the Zollverein, depended on it for subsistence. Frankfort-on-the-Oder, Breslau, Liegnitz, Magdeburgh, Erfurt, Cologne, Dusseldorf, Aix, and the province of Hanover, are the principal wool-spinning districts of Prussia. The chief seat of her cloth manufacture is the Rhine Province, which contains 208 manufactories, with 1,264 power and 3,678 hand-loom, employing 16,537 hands; next follow the provinces of Silesia, Saxony, and Brandenburg. The woollen industry of the kingdom of Saxony is next in importance to that of Prussia. The Germans have, in fact, now advanced to a stage where they can manufacture considerably more wool than they can grow. It was recently estimated that the Zollverein contained 27,793,329 sheep, but the entire value of the raw wool manufactured in Germany in 1867 is estimated

at \$5,000,000 thalers. Of this sum 53,000,000, or 62 per cent. was paid for imported wool. As in other branches of manufacture, so in the woollen trade, the Germans have set up a rivalry which, however damaging to other countries, is commendable as regards their own interests, and must evoke the admiration of their competitors.—*Globe*.

“*Manchester Evening News.*” Aug. 5th, 1869.

Our market continues in the same dull apathetic state, without animation of any kind, and a general desire to do as little business as possible on the buyer's part. Nevertheless it cannot be pronounced lower, and, considering the absence of business, prices generally remain firm.

Messrs. Outram and Co., New Hall Lane Mill, Preston, have this week given notice of a reduction in wages of 10 per cent. It is feared that this will be followed by others, and where the operatives are at work at other mills at the reduction of 5 per cent. much complaint is made by those employed in the weaving department on account of having to wait for beams. In many instances there are as many as 20 under one overlooker. At the mill of Messrs. G. Smith and Son, the workpeople are working the material up, when the concern will be closed, throwing a considerable number of hands out of employment. The Spinners and Minders' Association continues to send batches of emigrants every week to America, and this week, also, the Preston Operative Weavers' Association will have another ballot, and will probably send about six away.

We are not surprised that the Preston mill-owners find themselves again compelled to reduce wages. We fear the example will have to be followed by the whole of Lancashire, for it is impossible now to compete in any respect with the Continent, where our generous free trade has established untaxed machinery and untaxed coal; meanwhile parading at our grand national exhibitions, how great is our skill, how acute our invention, how beautiful our machinery! Foreigners, chuckling, get instructed, order one machine as a sample, and get it copied in thousands at half price in Zurich or Belgium.

Then they have the advantage of wages at 300 to 400 per cent. less than ours, and run mills (with two sets of hands) night and day. Here are serious questions for our Chambers of Commerce, our foreign secretaries, our political economists, and our benevolent free traders; questions the solution of which will decide whether England is any longer to maintain her place at the head of nations. General reciprocal free trade would be a grand thing; but is England to be ruined and other nations enriched—for the sake of an idea?

0 1200 02440 0702

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY F



AA 000 756 176

**THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara**

**THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.**

Series 9482

